

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

TONY FLORES,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOCELYN LARKINS,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00359-TL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an action brought under the Copyright Act regarding allegedly infringing videos uploaded to YouTube. The matter comes before the Court *sua sponte* (on its own motion), upon review of the record. Plaintiff Tony Flores filed a proposed action on March 14, 2024. Dkt. No. 1. Plaintiff's case is currently deficient in two ways.

First, a Notice of Filing Deficiency was mailed to Defendant on March 19, 2024, stating that Plaintiff had failed to file the required Patent/Trademark form. Dkt. No. 2. The form, Form AO-121, *Report on the Filing or Determination of an Action or Appeal Regarding Copyright*, is available on the Court's website. The Notice advised Plaintiff to correct this deficiency by filing

1 the form with the Court as soon as possible. *Id.* To date, Plaintiff has failed to file the required  
2 Form AO-121.

3 Second, Plaintiff appears to have taken no action to serve the Defendant in this case. An  
4 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (i.e., without payment of the filing fee) was granted on  
5 March 20, 2024 (Dkt. No. 3), and the Complaint was filed on the same day (Dkt. No. 4). Plaintiff  
6 does not appear to have requested summons. To date, no proof of service has been filed, and no  
7 defendant has appeared in this action. Indeed, there has been no activity in the case since  
8 Plaintiff signed up for e-filing and to receive electronic service on April 3, 2024. Dkt. No. 5.

9 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) states that, “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90  
10 days after the complaint is filed, the court . . . must dismiss the action without prejudice against  
11 that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” This 90-day limit “does not  
12 apply to service in a foreign country,” *id.*, but a plaintiff does not have “an unlimited time” for  
13 such foreign service; the Court may set a reasonable time limit. *See, e.g., Inst. Of Cetacean Rsch.*  
14 *v. Sea Shepherd Conservation Soc’y*, 153 F. Supp. 3d 1291, 1320 (W.D. Wash. 2015)  
15 (expressing concerns about failure to serve foreign party and setting a deadline for such service).  
16 The Court may dismiss a case for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute their case. *See Ash v. Cvetkov*,  
17 739 F.2d 493, 496–97 (9th Cir. 1984) (“It is within the inherent power of the court to sua sponte  
18 dismiss a case for lack of prosecution.”); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (involuntary dismissal  
19 where a plaintiff fails to prosecute).

20 Here, more than ninety (90) days have elapsed since the complaint was filed. The Court  
21 notes that Defendant Jocelyn Larkins is allegedly “an individual who is physically located  
22 outside the United States” (Dkt. No. 4 ¶ 21), but Defendant’s foreign location does not remove  
23  
24

1 Plaintiff's obligation to effect service. To date, no proof of service, appearance of Defendant, or  
2 other indication of service has been filed.

3 Accordingly, Plaintiff is DIRECTED to SHOW CAUSE, **within fourteen (14) days of this**  
4 **Order (i.e., by September 26, 2024)**, why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice  
5 for failure to: (1) comply with the filing requirements as detailed in the Clerk of Court's May 19,  
6 2024, Notice of Deficiency (Dkt. No. 2); (2) serve process; or (3) prosecute this action.

7 DATED this 12th day of September 2024.

8   
9 Tana Lin  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24